

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREMAYNE DEAN CARROLL et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NEWSOM et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00224-ADA-HBK (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL

(ECF No. 8)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING  
ORDER

(ECF No. 1)

The assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order ("Motion for TRO"), filed on February 8, 2023, be denied. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 10.)

Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. As the Magistrate Judge noted in her findings and recommendations, Plaintiff did not follow the procedural requirements for a Temporary Restraining Order. (ECF No. 8 at 3.) Further, Plaintiff's Motion is devoid of any facts alleging wrongdoing by either of the two named Defendants, which precludes injunctive relief of any kind. (*Id.* at 4). Finally, while Plaintiff filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations, the objections do not articulate a cognizable

1 basis for rejecting the findings and recommendations, fail to object to any specific finding, and  
2 repeat many of the allegations in her Motion for TRO. (*See generally* ECF No. 10).

3 Plaintiff's filing also includes requests for (1) a 90-day extension of time, (2) appointment  
4 of counsel, and (3) "reconsideration of TRO" which the Court construes as a Request for  
5 Reconsideration as to an unspecified order. (*Id.* 10 at 1). The Magistrate Judge previously denied  
6 the construed Motion for Extension of Time and Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (ECF No.  
7 11). To the extent Plaintiff wishes to file a Request for Reconsideration as to a final ruling in this  
8 matter, she must comply with the procedural requirements of Local Rule 303(c) including  
9 "specifically designat[ing] the ruling, or part thereof, objected to and the basis for that objection."  
10 E.D. Cal. R. 303(c); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.


11 According to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this Court  
12 has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

13 1. The findings and recommendations issued by the Magistrate Judge on February 21, 2023,  
14 are **ADOPTED IN FULL**.

15 2. Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, filed on February 8, 2023, is  
16 **DENIED**.

17  
18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: June 30, 2023

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE